

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-96
H. J. Res. 591

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. J. Res. 591	.1
Digest of Public Law 89-96	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. J. RES. 591

July 28, 1965 House Appropriations Committee reported
H. J. Res. 591 without amendment. H.
Report No. 689. Print of bill and report.

Both Houses passed H. J. Res. 591 without
amendment.

July 30, 1965 Approved: Public Law 89-96.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-96

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1966.

Provides, pending the enactment of the regular appropriation bills, for the continuation of appropriations for programs and activities of the Federal Government through August 31, 1965.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 29, 1965
For actions of July 28, 1965
89th-1st; No. 137

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....4,12,33	Farm program.....7,25,31	Saline Water.....6
Atomic energy.....1,11	Flour.....9	Soil erosion.....16
CCC inventories.....20	Food.....8	Sugar.....21
Checks.....3	Foreign trade.....10,29	Stockpiling.....20
Cigarette labeling.....32	Fund adjustments.....4	Trade expansion.....10,29
Claims.....27	Health.....13	Travel.....3,19
Consumer research.....8	Lands.....14	Vocational
Continuing	Legislative program.....11	rehabilitation.....11
appropriations.....12	Livestock.....26	Voting record.....23
Cotton.....7	Military construction...5	Water pollution.....18
Dairy.....26	Pay raise...3,27	Water resources.....16,24
Drought relief.....30	Personnel.....3,19,27	Weather.....28
Education.....2	Plant life.....16	Wheat.....9
Electrification.....1,11	Poverty.....17,22	
Family farms.....15	Research.....6,8,16,28	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses passed appropriations continuing resolution. Sen. Mondale expressed concern over "plight" of family farmer. Rep. Findley criticized cotton program. Rep. Fascell praised USDA consumer research program. Rep. Cooley submitted measure to provide for consideration of farm bill.

HOUSE

1. **ATOMIC ENERGY; ELECTRIFICATION.** Agreed to a Rules Committee resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8856, to amend the Atomic Energy Act to clarify the intent of Congress regarding regulation of the sale, generation, or transmission of electric power produced through the use of nuclear facilities licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. pp. 17952-4

2. EDUCATION. Agreed to a Rules Committee resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8310, the proposed Educational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965. p. 17954
3. PERSONNEL. The "Daily Digest" states that the Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 4653 (amended), to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; and H. R. 9020 (amended), to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel costs for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment. p. D713
The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee "approved a subcommittee draft on the proposed Federal and postal pay raise." p. D714
4. FUND ADJUSTMENTS. "The "Daily Digest" states that the Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6438 (amended), to authorize any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to such departments and establishments, or any bureau or office thereof. p. D713
5. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 8439, fiscal 1966 authorizations for military construction, which includes a provision for reimbursement of CCC. p. D714
6. SALINE WATER RESEARCH. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees agreed to file a report on S. 24, to increase authorizations for expansion and extension of the saline water conversion program. p. D714
7. COTTON. Rep. Findley criticized the cotton proposal recently reported by the Agriculture Committee and the current cotton program, and inserted a USDA report on the first 11 months of its operation which he states shows that "mill margins are up again and so are textile prices." pp. 17974-5
8. CONSUMER RESEARCH. Rep. Fascell commended the USDA consumer research program for the numerous achievements in the revolution in food. p. 17983
9. WHEAT; FLOUR. Received from the State Dept. a reply to the GAO report on "unnecessary costs resulting from an inflexible policy of donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under the Agricultural Act of 1949." p. 17989
10. TRADE EXPANSION. Rep. Gross urged early consideration of proposed legislation to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. pp. 17961-3
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that today (Thurs.) the House will consider H. R. 8856, an amendment to section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act; and H. R. 8310, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. p. D713

SENATE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 591, the appropriations continuing resolution (pp. 17804-5, 17806, 17885-7). This

measure will now be sent to the President. The House Appropriations Committee had reported the measure earlier (H. Rept. 689)(p. 17989). Sen. Hayden stated that the "resolution simply extends from July 31 to August 31 existing provisions of law to provide funds for the operation of those agencies for which the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted" (p. 17804).

13. HEALTH. By a vote of 70 to 24, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6675, to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, etc. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 17803-4, 17805-12, 17813-23
14. LANDS. Passed as reported S. 625, to permit the sale to landowners who have fenced in, or utilized with their own lands, adjacent tracts of public domain lands. p. 17843
15. FAMILY FARMER. Sen. Mondale expressed concern over the "plight" of the family farmer and inserted several letters which he stated was "a representative sampling of small town interest in the vitality of the American family farm." pp. 17866-8
16. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Jackson inserted a letter from Secretary of the Interior Udall reviewing research recently conducted by American geologists in foreign countries on soil erosion and water shortage problems. pp. 17870-1
Sen. Holland inserted the report of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on the development of our river systems, including a recommendation for a study of the possibility of breeding agricultural plant life capable of taking its water supply from sea water. pp. 17871-2
17. POVERTY. Sen. McNamara inserted Vice President Humphrey's recent speech reviewing the purposes and accomplishments of the poverty program. pp. 17872-4
18. WATER POLLUTION. Conferees were appointed on S. 4, the proposed Water Quality Act of 1965 (pp. 17841-3). House conferees have not yet been appointed.
19. PERSONNEL; TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Brewster criticized a suggestion by Najeeb Halaby, former Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, "that Federal Government employees use only Dulles or Washington National Airport for air travel." p. 17868
20. STOCKPILING. Received the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal stockpile inventories as of May 1965, including CCC commodity inventories. pp. 17824-32

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. SUGAR. Rep. Dent inserted an article discussing U. S. importation of Latin American sugar and opposing the proposed sugar import fee. pp. A4154-55.
22. POVERTY. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quie using charts listing salaries of consultants and experts employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity to show that the wage level "does not indicate any great degree of sacrifice." pp. A4157-61

Extension of remarks of Rep. Ayres expressing dissatisfaction that Republican-proposed amendments to the extension of the Antipoverty Act were "completely overridden" and inserting an article on the subject. pp. A4165

23. VOTING RECORD. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cameron discussing his reasons for voting in favor of the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Economic Opportunity Act and voting against the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act. pp. A4165-7
24. WATER. Extension of remarks of Rep. Callan commending and inserting an article commenting on the need for water conservation. p. A4169
25. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Findley inserting a letter from a constituent farmer opposing H. R. 9811, the omnibus farm bill. p. A4173
26. LIVESTOCK. Rep. Long (Md.) inserted an article, "Woodbine [Md.] Cow is Notable Producer." pp. A4175-6.

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. PERSONNEL. H. R. 10147 by Rep. Udall, and H. R. 10148 by Rep. Olsen, Mont., to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
S. 2340 by Sen. Ervin, to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author pp. 17839-40
28. RESEARCH; WEATHER. H. R. 10136 by Rep. Rivers, Alaska, and H. R. 10138 by Rep. Thompson, Texas, to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs; etc.; to Government Operations Committee.
29. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 10135 by Rep. Fogarty, to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of author pp. 17987-8
30. DROUGHT RELIEF. H. R. 10145 by Rep. Resnick, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct programs to reduce the impact of droughts on rural residents, small municipalities, agriculture and livestock enterprises; to Agriculture Committee.
31. FARM PROGRAM. H. Res. 490 by Rep. Cooley, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas; to Rules Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

32. CIGARETTE LABELING. S. 559, to regulate the labeling of cigarettes. Approved July 27, 1965 (Public Law 89-92).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

JULY 28, 1965.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. J. Res. 591]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the House Joint Resolution 591, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes, reports the same to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the joint resolution be passed.

This joint resolution merely extends from July 31 through August 31 existing provisions of law (Public Law 89-58) to provide funds for the operation of those agencies of the Government for which the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted. The terms and conditions of availability were described in House Report No. 553, which accompanied House Joint Resolution 553 at the time of its passage by the House (June 18, 1965).

There follows a tabulation of the original and revised committee reporting schedule for the regular appropriation bills for 1966, and the dates actually reported and passed on the bills thus far processed:

The regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966 as of July 28, 1965

Bill	Original report- ing schedule (Mar. 10, 1965)	Revised report- ing schedule (May 18, 1965)	Re- ported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congres- sional action
District of Columbia.....	Mar. 18	-----	Mar. 18	Mar. 23	June 22	July 13
Interior.....	Mar. 25	-----	Mar. 25	Mar. 30	May 26	June 15
Treasury-P.O.....	Apr. 1	-----	Apr. 1	Apr. 5	June 8	June 28
Labor-H.E.W.....	Apr. 29	-----	Apr. 29	May 4		
Independent Offices.....	May 6	-----	May 6	May 11	July 13	
Defense.....	May 13	June 18	June 17	June 23		
Agriculture.....	May 20	-----	May 20	May 26	July 13	
Legislative.....	May 20	June 3	June 3	June 8	July 12	July 21
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	May 27	-----	May 27	June 1		
Military Construction.....	June 3	June 10	(¹)			
Public Works.....	June 10	June 17	June 17	June 22		
Foreign Assistance.....	June 17	June 24	(¹)			

¹ Military Construction and Foreign Assistance bills awaiting approval of authorizing legislation.

NOTE.—A special Labor-H.E.W. supplemental and the usual "end-of-the-session" supplemental, for which no dates were shown, are not listed.



H. J. RES. 591

[Report No. 689]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 28, 1965

Mr. MAHON introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the
Committee on Appropriations

JULY 28, 1965

Considered and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966,
and for other purposes.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of
- 4 June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-58), is hereby amended by
- 5 striking out "July 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof
- 6 "August 31, 1965".

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 591

[Report No. 689]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal
year 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

JULY 28, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JULY 28, 1965

Considered and passed

H. J. RES. 591

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 28 (legislative day, JULY 27), 1965

Received; read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and
for other purposes.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of
4 June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-58), is hereby amended by
5 striking out "July 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof
6 "August 31, 1965".

Passed the House of Representatives July 28, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 591

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal
year 1966, and for other purposes.

JULY 28 (legislative day, JULY 27), 1965

Received; read twice, considered, read the third time,
and passed



United States
of America

Please return to
Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1965

No. 137

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 27, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all that is fair and free, out of the darkness, with its starry beacons twinkling with a light from which our earth had turned, has come in Thy good providence a bright new day wrapped in the splendor of another dawn.

At noontide of this day of solemnly proclaimed national purpose and decision, we would bow in reverence, dedicating anew our heart's desires and our mind's powers to the holy service of Thee, our Father God, to the weal of this dear land of our hope and prayer and to the healing of a sorely wounded world.

Even in these days of tumult, stir our hearts with the ever-haunting beauty of that radiant vision which, by faith, is brought near when—

"Nation with nation, land with land,
Unarmed shall live as comrades free.
In every heart and brain shall throb,
The pulse of one fraternity."

We lift our prayer in the name of that Holy One, whose truth at last shall make all men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 27, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 27, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 559. An act to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes;

S. 1462. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle

Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3329. An act to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; and

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 510. An act to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 175th anniversary, on August 4, 1965, of the founding of the U.S. Coast Guard at Newburyport, Mass.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 3329. An act to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the conference report on the medicare bill now before the Senate?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall vote for the conference report as I voted for the bill, but I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished majority whip, two questions, if I may. My questions are as follows:

First. Why was it necessary, in the opinion of the Senator, to require 3 days of hospitalization before a man could receive home care? It seems to me that such a requirement would lead to abuse of hospital privileges, and that the amendment was a very wise one.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The House position was that if we did not do what

the conferees decided upon, many people would proceed to draw benefits for home health service who were not actually sick enough to require hospitalization. The House conferees felt that they did not wish to provide, under the basic hospital program, care for people who were not that sick. It was felt that people should be afflicted with an illness sufficiently clear to require hospitalization before they would be qualified for nursing home care or before they would qualify for home health service. They also pointed out that there is home health care without hospitalization under the voluntary supplementary program.

It was felt that a great deal of money would be spent under the basic program for medical expenses in situations in which a person was sufficiently ill to stay home and go to bed for a few days, but was not sufficiently ill to require hospitalization.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The conferees felt—and the Senator agrees—that there might be more abuse in not having a man or woman go to a hospital for 3 days than to have it otherwise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There would be less abuse in having a person hospitalized before he was eligible to receive nursing-home care rather than providing the home care without the hospitalization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Some of us pointed out the great savings that could be achieved, if, in line with the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, we would not require that a person go to a hospital first if that person were sick and needed help in order to qualify that person for entry into a nursing home or for home health benefits. According to the House position, the argument against that procedure was that if we did not require a person to be hospitalized, a great deal of home health care would be required for people who were not ill enough to justify health treatment under the basic program.

It was felt that, above all, we must try to avoid mere custodial care of people who are in poor health and who will continue to be in poor health but who could not qualify under the acute illness requirements of the basic program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then we must try to follow out the program as it is now arranged and see how it works. I hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate and other members of the Finance Committee will be open to a thought on that subject after a certain amount of trial experience.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am certainly open to suggestions. I worked to support the position of the Senate in conference. I hope that the proposal will be one of those that will be studied by the Advisory Council, and that recommendations will be made so that we can see to it that a person need not be hospitalized when his sickness is of such a degree that he qualifies for the home health care or for nursing home care provided in the bill. If properly administered—and that is where great fear at the administrative level comes in—the Senator's position would be eminently sound. If we could guarantee that a

great number of people who are in poor health would require no more than custodial care to qualify for home health service, a great deal of money would be saved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

I should like to ask one more question. The conferees eliminated another section that I thought was invaluable, and that was in relation to drugs. As I remember, the proposal related to a commission to study the effect of drugs. I believe that drugs represent about 28 percent of the cost of medical services. Will the Senator give an explanation as to why that provision was eliminated?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was the view of the House conferees that the subject should be studied. It is one of the most important questions to be studied by the House committee, the Senate committee, the administration, and the Advisory Council. But the House conferees felt that if we should write into the bill a requirement that a study be made, with all that that implies, including a commitment that we might agree with the study, and adopt it, this would be undesirable. The House felt that we should not undertake any commitment prior to making studies and knowing what the entire program would require. The overall program will require a great amount of study. There are many things that we might do under this measure and which we might change after we gain experience.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Who will make the study, as provided in the conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Secretary is directed to carry on a study of the program. The Advisory Council on Social Security is directed to review the scope of coverage and the adequacy of benefits of both program A and program B.

So the Advisory Council on Social Security will have that responsibility, and that will be one of the foremost subjects that will be studied. We shall have a detailed study of the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When is the report to be made? Next year or the year after?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that the report would be prepared for us as early as possible. The next Council will be appointed in 1968, but I would hope that we might have information on that subject sooner. I feel sure that we shall be proceeding in this field, and that in the meanwhile the Department will be conducting its own studies.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the advice of the distinguished Senator. I know the conference was a difficult one. A great many questions were dealt with. I appreciate the Senator's answers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. I wish we could have prevailed and have had the Senator's amendment agreed to. In the main, we prevailed with respect to the overwhelming number of Senate amendments, although I regret that we were unable to prevail on some good amendments.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Since medicare will soon become a reality, I hope that—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, to permit the Senator from Arizona to bring up an important joint resolution?

Mr. BASS. I yield.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1966

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 591, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 591) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution simply extends from July 31 to August 31 existing provisions of law to provide funds for the operation of those agencies for which the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted.

All authority under this temporary resolution expires on August 31, 1965.

For the information of the Senate, I would like to report the status of the various appropriation bills.

The appropriation bills for the Departments of the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, legislative establishment, and the District of Columbia have cleared the Congress and have been sent to the White House.

The appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture and independent offices have passed both Houses and are now in conference.

Four appropriation bills are in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The Department of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare appropriation bill has been marked up in the subcommittee and will be reported to the Senate shortly. The hearings have been completed on the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the judiciary appropriation bill, and it is expected it will be reported to the Senate not later than next week. The subcommittees are currently working on the appropriation bills for the Department of Defense and for public works.

The remaining three appropriation bills for this session—the foreign aid appropriation bill, the military construction appropriation bill, and the supplemental appropriation bill—are in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting the enactment of authorizing legislation.

I urge the passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to the regular order, which is the conference report on H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to House Joint Resolution 591, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 591 be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana ask for the regular order?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 6675.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Now that medicare is about to become a reality, and since it is a complicated piece of legislation, I hope that the Senator from Louisiana will instruct the staff to make a complete analysis of the act and have it published in layman's language, so that the average American will be able to understand it. This will be of benefit to Members of Congress who must reply to inquiries from constituents as to exactly what the legislation will do. I hope that such an explanation will be available at an early date.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I placed in the RECORD last night an explanation of the conference report.

Mr. BASS. I understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Also, at the conclusion of my statement, I placed in the RECORD a statement of the principal features of the bill. I believe the Senator will find that summary helpful.

Mr. BASS. I hope that we may have available a pamphlet that might be pub-

lished by the committee, giving a detailed explanation, in laymen's language, of the provisions of the bill. It would be of much benefit to persons who have inquired concerning the provisions of the legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall seek to obtain that information for the Senator. I understand his problem. A great many things need to be explained, so that everyone will be apprised of his rights.

Mr. BASS. That is correct. Certain amendments were deleted and others included. A rather detailed explanation would be useful for the average citizen, who otherwise would not be able to understand the contents of the bill. I hope that the committee will give us the benefit of such an explanation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall seek to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I thought the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was worthwhile. It provided that persons who are under social security could begin to withdraw reduced amounts at age 60 if they became unemployed. I understand that amendment was deleted. Perhaps the reason that action has been given. I should like to know the position of the House with respect to its deletion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, before I respond to the Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the conference report be taken at 1:30 p.m., the time intervening between now and then to be equally divided between the Senator from Louisiana and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall need about 10 minutes. I hope that I may be granted that much time.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, after consulting with Senators and assuring them that they will have the time they require, I renew my request that the Senate vote on the conference report at 1:30 p.m. and that the time be equally divided between the minority leader and the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I asked a question, and I should like to repeat it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to repeat the question without all the interruptions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator yield time for that purpose?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. My question concerns an amendment which was passed by the Senate. This amendment was sponsored and introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. His amendment would have provided that people who are covered under the social security system and become unemployed could begin to withdraw a reduced payment at the age of 60.

That provision was deleted in conference. I thought that it was a meritorious amendment. I should like to know the reason for the deletion of it in conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree that the amendment was a good one. I supported the amendment and the similar one the Senate adopted in the past. The discussion concerning this amendment required almost a full day in the conference. The amendment is highly meritorious. It should have been agreed to, in whole or in part.

The House objected to it because in the first year, under the proposed amendment, there would have been a drain on the trust fund of approximately \$500 million. There would be a drain on the funds because more money would be paid out than would be taken in, even though this expenditure would be offset in later years.

The Byrd amendment would pay for itself over a period of time because of the actuarial reduction. However, the fund would not start recouping this money for about 20 years. The House was extremely reluctant to accept the amendment at a time when the hospital insurance program was calling for large initial expenditures of money.

I predict that this amendment will be enacted into law within the next 5 or 6 years. I have no doubt that the amendment is a good one. I supported it. I am as enthusiastic about that amendment as is the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope we can reduce the time of 5 years to a year or so. I have a great deal of concern and sympathy for those people who reach the age of 60 and cannot find a job no matter how much they try. Their unemployment compensation runs out. They become a public charge if they have no other way of receiving income.

They would not receive any more money in the long run, if they were to wait until they were 65 years of age. They should be permitted to collect in their time of greatest need, even though it is a smaller amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, but I first state that the Senator from Rhode Island is correct. The conference committee came closer to being deadlocked on this issue than on anything else.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Louisiana on this issue. I have talked with literally thousands of people in Wisconsin concerning this issue.

No issue interests men at the factory gates in Wisconsin more than does this

issue. People want an opportunity to retire at the age of 60. It is true that the option would involve a reduction of their benefits to two-thirds of their scheduled social security benefits.

Many people can get along with that much social security if they have income from another source. Perhaps their husbands or wives are working or are also retired.

The Senator from West Virginia pointed out that this amendment, if it were agreed to, would help solve our unemployment problem to a significant degree. If the amendment had been agreed to, it would open up at least a half million jobs for other people that had been vacated by the retiring 60 and 61 years old.

The Senator from Louisiana and the other conferees had to give in on some things. However, they did a superb job in conference.

I hope that in the future this provision can be enacted into law, preferably as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island, in a year or two.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not want my remarks to be construed as being in criticism of the conferees. I know how hard the Senate conferees fought for this measure.

As I understand the situation, there was some apprehension as to the stability of the fund in the event that we undertook to provide such benefits at this time without further study.

I would hope that this matter would be studied very objectively and that we would do something about this problem in the near future.

I congratulate all conferees for the excellent job they did. I do not believe that this is a perfect piece of legislation. It could not be perfect. We have not satisfied everyone. That would be impossible.

I do believe that this is the first step in the right direction. This is a milestone in the field of social security and social justice.

I congratulate the committee. I shall vote for the conference report with a full heart.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is my understanding that House Joint Resolution 591, which was previously called up, and to which there was some initial question, has now been cleared on all sides.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, the conference report on H.R. 6675, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 591.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield time for that purpose?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 3 minutes for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 591) making continu-

ing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 591) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I notice that the drug study amendment was eliminated. I ask the Senator what happened in relation to that measure.

I understand that there is some feeling that the measure will be studied nonetheless.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Secretary is directed in the bill to carry on studies of the programs. The Advisory Council on Social Security is directed to review the scope, the coverage, and the adequacy of benefits under programs A and B.

It was the view of the House conferees that they did not want to commit themselves to an answer in one particular area before they knew what the overall recommendations would be, and that this would be one of the many areas in which recommendations could be expected. That being the case, the House felt that they did not want to make a commitment to do what such a group recommended, but they did recognize that this is an area in which a study should be undertaken and that it should be studied also by the committees, the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Committee on Finance.

They also recognized that when our recommendations are ready, we should present them. They did not feel that they should commit themselves in this bill or imply, by agreeing to a study in this fashion, that they agreed to the recommendations not knowing what they might be.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we may look forward with confidence to the fact that this objective will be accomplished.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It will be studied at the departmental level and then by the Advisory Council on Social

Security. We expect that the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance will also look into the matter.

The position of the Senator on this measure is very sound. This is a very important segment of the problem. We should like to provide a better answer than we have at the present time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague for his most statesmanlike assurance. I know that the assurance will be carried through.

Mr. President, I notice that, with relation to the struggle we carried on in the Senate on the question of cash tips, there was a compromise.

I ask the Senator how the conferees expected that the social security funds would be affected by the fact that the employer is excused from the social security tax liability on such tips.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, after battling about this matter for a number of hours, we finally reached an area of a compromise. One proposal was that we strike the provision from the bill. If we had not reached a compromise, the provision relating to tips would have been removed from the bill.

In regard to the argument made by the senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from New York, which was also our position, we felt that these people were entitled to protection. We also found that it was possible to give them this protection without increasing the tax or providing an additional burden on the funds. The way that it worked out was that if the employees would pay the employee share of the tax, they would then be carrying their own weight so far as the fund was concerned.

Furthermore, we took the attitude of the Senate with regard to the employer: that inasmuch as the employer did not pay the tip—that the tip was really paid by the public or the customer—the employer should not be taxed for it. Having arrived at that conclusion, we took the administrative provisions as the House passed them and took the Senate philosophy that since the employer did not pay the tip, therefore he should not have to pay the tax on it. Having arrived at that conclusion, we found that it did not impose an added burden on the fund.

Mr. JAVITS. That last expression is very important. I know the employees would want to know and establish for the record that the additional benefits which they would receive by virtue of the social security tax on tips would not be provided, notwithstanding the free ride given to the employer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. We concluded that the tax should not be imposed on the employer and that sufficient money would get in the fund as a result of the contributions of the employee. We worked that matter out on the administrative basis that the House had provided and concluded that it would not place a burden on the fund. We agreed on the provision to let the employers do the collecting and book-keeping and remit the money, but not to impose the originally proposed employer's tax.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1965

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words:

I Thessalonians 4: 2: Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving.

O Lord, our God, we are drawn to Thee in prayer by many deep yearnings; our natures are diverse but our needs are one.

We feel the tug of a tie that unites us with Thee and our fellow men and links our life to an eternal enterprise.

Grant us the will and the power to live each day more deeply, more usefully, more fruitfully, and more courageously; we turn to Thee for comfort and command, for insight and inspiration.

We rejoice that Thou hast given us Thy sympathy and care. We daily accept life as an adventure and confidently launch out upon all sorts of enterprises.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 251. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; and

S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of last Monday, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 591) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Texas several questions regarding the status of appropriation bills thus far acted upon by the House and the status of the supplemental request which will come before us within

the next few weeks. It seems to me that we are approaching a very serious situation as far as the costs of the war in Vietnam are concerned. It is my understanding that a request will come before us today for partial funding of the cost of this war and the replenishment of stocks used during the last 12-months period. This particular request will be the first installment on the total overall cost that will be incurred in southeast Asia during the next 12-month period.

My question to the chairman is this: In view of the fact that these costs are mounting, is consideration going to be given by this Congress, through its House Appropriations Committee, to a reappraisal of our budgetary needs for the fiscal year 1966, having in mind that we cannot do business as usual with our domestic spending programs if we are going to finance the rising costs of the war in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], that I assume an additional request for funds in connection with South Vietnam will be made. I have no ironclad assurance to that effect.

I would say this, however—and I do not try to preempt the President in making any announcement which he might want to make in connection with South Vietnam—of course, I know that several hundreds of millions of dollars; in fact, far in excess of \$1 billion—several billion dollars—will be required during the current fiscal year for the fighting of the war in South Vietnam, if it continues to escalate along the lines which are now indicated.

So it is perfectly clear to all who know anything about the situation, in my judgment, that a large sum of additional money will be required if this struggle continues in its present intensity.

The gentleman mentioned the overall budget. Under leave to extend, may I say that the President has made many recommendations and Congress has been in the process, and is still in the process, of making up its mind about them. I personally have voted against a number of them.

The object of the antipoverty program and many of the other proposed programs to which reference was made is to provide a new strength and vitality to the country. I would say there is wide agreement on the great objects in the majority of instances; the arguments come, in great measure, over who should undertake the work and the exact methods and procedures.

Under the firm hand of the President, the departments and agencies of Government have been making some progress in saving money and holding down budget expenditures. Especially notable have

been Secretary McNamara's accomplishments in this connection. The Government has been moving rapidly toward a balanced budget—not rapidly enough in my judgment, but nonetheless making important strides in this direction. In the fiscal year 1965 just recently closed, for example, Federal budget income was higher, and budget expenditures were lower, than had been estimated last January, in consequence of which the earlier deficit prediction was nearly halved from the January figure. The final deficit of \$3.5 billion was reduced nearly three-fifths from the year before. Significantly, budget expenditures were over \$1 billion less than they were in the year before, the first such year-to-year expenditure reduction in 5 years.

Further progress toward a balanced budget was pointed to and reflected in the President's budget of last January for the current fiscal year 1966. But events in Vietnam are affecting the outlook; military spending will of course clearly be higher than then budgeted. War emergencies have a way of throwing budgets out of whack. I recall some observations by a former distinguished Member of this body who later became President. In a discourse about national budgets and appropriations way back in 1879, and referring to the high importance to the people of the business of determining what taxes to levy and what expenditures to appropriate, James A. Garfield said:

And this problem presents itself, every year, under new conditions. An adjustment which is wise and equitable for 1 year may be wholly inadequate for the next. In time of peace, perhaps the most important test of the scale of national expenditures is that of population. From these elements, the just scale of increase could be readily ascertained if all our calculations could rest upon the basis of perpetual peace; but war, that mischief on the largest scale, overturns all ordinary calculations.

There are many uncertainties in this world confrontation with totalitarianism and communism and they inescapably introduce uncertainties into the national budget and appropriation demands.

Mr. Speaker, seldom does the Congress—any Congress—give a President all the money he requests. And that is true of this session. The House has made some reduction in the President's budget requests in connection with every appropriation bill thus far voted on. I will include a summarization of the figures on the situation down to date, but before doing so, I should say something in explanation of the pending resolution. It is a rather simple proposition.

The resolution merely extends for another month, through August 31, existing provisions of law—Public Law 85-58—to provide funds for the operation of

those agencies of the Government for which the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted. The terms and conditions of availability were more fully described in the committee report which accompanied the first continuing resolution at the time of its passage by the House on June 18, 1965.

I should also emphasize that, following the customary practice, the amounts to be available under the resolution are on a minimum basis pending disposition of the remaining regular appropriations for the year.

Our hearings on the two regular bills yet to be reported to the House—foreign assistance and military construction, involving some \$6 billion-plus—were completed some weeks ago but we have been sidelined by lack of the necessary authorization bills. We also have some supplemental bill yet to be formulated but the exact amounts involved are not now determinable.

I include two summaries—the appropriation bill processing schedule, and a résumé of the amounts involved in the general appropriation bills thus far reported:

The regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966 as of July 28, 1965

Bill	Original reporting schedule (Mar. 10, 1965)	Revised reporting schedule (May 18, 1965)	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action
District of Columbia	Mar. 18		Mar. 18	June 22	July 13	June 15
Interior	Mar. 25		Mar. 25	Mar. 30	May 26	June 28
Treasury-Post Office	Apr. 1		Apr. 1	Apr. 5	June 8	
Labor-HEW	Apr. 29		Apr. 29	May 4		
Independent offices	May 6		May 6	May 11	July 13	
Defense	May 13	June 18	June 17	June 23		
Agriculture	May 20		May 20	May 26	July 13	
Legislative	May 20	June 3	June 3	June 8	July 12	July 21
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	May 27		May 27	June 1		
Military construction	June 3	June 10	(1)			
Public works	June 10	June 17	June 17	June 22		
Foreign assistance	June 17	June 24	(1)			

¹ Military construction and foreign assistance bills awaiting approval of authorizing legislation.

NOTE.—A special Labor-HEW supplemental and the usual "end of the session" supplemental, for which no dates were shown, are not listed.

The appropriation bills, 89th Congress, 1st session, as of July 28, 1965

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	House			House action compared with budget estimates
	Budget estimates to House	Date passed	Amount as passed	
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS				
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)-----	\$1,742,209,000	Jan. 29	\$1,600,000,000	—\$142,209,000
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)-----	2,226,456,933	Apr. 6	2,118,333,083	—108,123,850
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)-----	700,000,000	May 5	700,000,000	-----
Total, 1965 supplementals-----	4,668,665,933		4,418,333,083	—250,332,850
1966 APPROPRIATIONS				
District of Columbia-----	(387,467,800)	Mar. 23	(356,300,500)	(—31,167,300)
Federal payment-----	53,122,000		44,122,000	—9,000,000
Loan authorization-----	(26,311,900)		(26,311,900)	-----
Interior-----	1,240,849,500	Mar. 30	1,184,090,300	—56,759,200
Loan authorization-----	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(—780,000)
Treasury-Post Office-----	6,708,510,000	Apr. 5	6,604,404,000	—104,106,000
Labor-HEW-----	8,293,814,000	May 4	7,964,034,000	—329,780,000
Independent offices-----	14,531,023,000	May 11	14,109,908,000	—421,115,000
Agriculture-----	5,815,134,000	May 26	5,717,832,000	—97,302,000
Loan authorizations-----	(787,000,000)		(787,000,000)	-----
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary-----	2,167,735,600	June 1	2,085,689,900	—82,045,700
Legislative-----	204,872,222	June 8	150,589,107	—54,283,115
Public Works-----	4,373,805,000	June 22	4,241,636,500	—132,168,500
Defense-----	45,248,844,000	June 23	45,188,244,000	—60,600,000
Total, 1966 bills to date-----	88,637,709,322		87,290,549,807	—1,347,159,515
Total, all appropriations to date-----	93,306,375,255		91,708,882,890	—1,597,492,365
Total, loan authorizations-----	(830,091,900)		(829,311,900)	(—780,000)

Title and bill No.	Senate			Senate action compared with—		Final appropriation		Date approved
	Budget estimates to Senate	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates	
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS								
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)-----	\$1,742,209,000	Feb. 3	\$1,600,000,000	—\$142,209,000	-----	\$1,600,000,000	—\$142,209,000	Feb. 11
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)-----	2,280,251,327	Apr. 27	2,257,869,415	—22,381,912	+\$139,536,332	2,227,563,977	—52,687,350	Apr. 30
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)-----	700,000,000	May 6	700,000,000	-----	-----	700,000,000	-----	May 7
Total, 1965 supplementals-----	4,722,460,327	-----	4,557,869,415	—164,590,912	+139,536,332	4,527,563,977	—194,896,350	-----
1966 APPROPRIATIONS								
District of Columbia-----	(389,346,800)	June 22	(364,358,347)	(—24,988,453)	(+8,057,847)	(360,228,500)	(—29,118,300)	July 16
Federal payment-----	53,122,000	-----	49,122,000	—4,000,000	+5,000,000	46,122,000	—7,000,000	-----
Loan authorization-----	(26,311,900)	-----	(26,311,900)	-----	-----	(26,311,900)	-----	-----
Interior-----	1,241,549,500	May 26	1,230,802,770	—10,746,730	+46,712,470	1,212,739,070	—28,810,430	June 28
Loan authorization-----	(16,780,000)	-----	(16,000,000)	(—780,000)	-----	(16,000,000)	(—780,000)	-----
Treasury-Post Office-----	2,749,770,000	June 8	2,698,669,000	—51,101,000	+1,094,265,000	2,769,444,000	—80,326,000	June 30
Labor-HEW-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Independent offices-----	14,538,698,000	July 13	14,299,897,980	—238,800,020	—189,989,980	-----	-----	-----
Agriculture-----	5,782,634,000	July 13	6,713,983,800	+932,349,800	+996,151,800	-----	-----	-----
Loan authorizations-----	(787,000,000)	-----	(852,000,000)	(+65,000,000)	(+65,000,000)	-----	-----	-----
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Legislative-----	243,261,617	July 12	190,840,167	—52,421,450	+40,251,060	189,993,297	—53,268,320	-----
Public Works-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 89th Congress, 1st session, as of July 28, 1965—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Senate			Senate action compared with—		Final appropriation		Date approved
	Budget estimates to Senate	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates	
1966 APPROPRIATIONS								
Defense								
Total, 1966 bills to date	\$29,609,035,117		\$30,183,315,717	+\$574,280,600	\$+2,372,370,310	\$9,118,298,367	-\$169,404,750	
Total, all appropriations to date	34,331,495,444		34,741,185,132	+409,689,688	+2,511,906,642	13,645,862,344	-364,301,100	
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)		(894,311,900)	(+64,220,000)	(+65,000,000)	(42,311,900)	(-780,000)	

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$12,300,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.

² Includes \$1,035,000,000 supplemental estimate for 1965 (S. Doc. 31).

NOTE.—Bills yet to be reported to the House: military construction; foreign assistance; and necessary supplementals.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Texas knows full well, however, that we are increasing the amount of money to be expended under the poverty program; we are increasing the amount of money to be expended for housing, and are increasing the amount of money to be expended under the social security bill. We are increasing all of these particular programs well above even budget levels while the funding for our increased efforts in Vietnam continue to be inadequate. On the domestic level we seem to be overfunding the wars we are waging while on the foreign policy level we want to fight now and pay later.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the American people should be fully apprised of the financial situation which this country faces and that we cannot do business on the installment basis, that we have to face up to the overall funding problem with which we are confronted in fiscal year 1966, and a discussion of this is needed and necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this resolution being considered today but it seems to me that the people of this country have not been apprised of the total financial needs which they are going to be called upon to meet in fiscal year 1966. We cannot continue to do business as usual and spend money as if we had all sorts of it here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 591

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-58), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1965".

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MAHON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on H.J. Res. 591 and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has entered an explanation of the purpose of the resolution. I regret the necessity of having to consider this second continuing resolution for the new fiscal year 1966 but there seems to be no responsible alternative in the circumstances. I therefore support it.

To fail to adopt the resolution would mean precipitate closing, on next Saturday night, of many essential functions of Government—or at least leave them stranded without funds with which to operate.

But in this connection may I stress that under the terms of the original resolution covering the current month of July, which the pending resolution extends by changing the expiration date to August 31, none of the funds provided can be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the preceding fiscal year. Furthermore, existing projects and activities may continue under the resolution only at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the fiscal 1965 rate; the budget request where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I see no responsible alternative to adoption of the pending resolution and urge its approval.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE COAST GUARD OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Olson, Minn.
Bow	Harvey, Ind.	Powell
Cahill	Keogh	Talcott
Colmer	Lindsay	Toll
Diggs	McVicker	Vivian
Duncan, Oreg.	Mailliard	Watson
Foley	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 413 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with Mr. O'BRIEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] had 1 hour and 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] had 1 hour and 14 minutes remaining. Before the Committee rose the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] had the floor.

The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, yesterday at the time the quorum call was made, I had just read a letter sent by Vice President HUMPHREY to Senator McNAMARA. For those who were not here, may I ask the indulgence of the House. It reads, as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, April 30, 1965.

Hon. PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAT: I am enclosing a copy of a recommended conscience clause for labor legislation which is being promoted by the Plymouth Brethren IV, conscientious objectors.

Since they cannot belong to any organization other than the church, they are seeking legislation in labor bills to protect genuine conscience.

Their ideas seem very good to me. I send them to you for your consideration.

Let me know if there is any way I can help in any matter.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

This is in contrast to a few labor leaders and others who want no exemption nor even any serious consideration by this House of the rights of any conscientious objector, and who indeed equate them with freeloaders.

I can understand this because let me say, that when the first two people came to my Portland office and asked for an appointment to discuss this matter, my first reaction was—they represent right-to-work groups. I was not predisposed to even discuss it with them. Oregon is not a right-to-work State but of course, we do have voluntarily-arrived-at union shop agreements.

Following other requests, however, I and members of my staff very carefully checked places of employment and we did find that certain individuals, in areas where union shop agreements were in effect—that certain people had that cruel choice of giving up their jobs or violating the teachings of their church in regard to union membership.

This should not happen in any one of the 31 States that do not have right-to-work laws, nor should we—by our action today—extend the possibilities of a similar injustice to the other 19 States.

The answer I think is in repealing 14(b), to adopt an amendment which

would provide for the conscientious objector, the same as we did yesterday in the social security bill when the conference report was adopted under the leadership of the most able chairman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Now it has been said that this matter will be taken care of by a directive from President Meany of the AFL-CIO to all local unions. May I ask—would you—who believe so deeply in civil rights—would you be satisfied with a directive from the national offices to all the locals saying there should be no discrimination against Negroes in the local union? You know you would not, and you did not. The provision against discrimination is written into the law.

Three days ago, labor leaders told me they wanted absolutely no amendments. Yesterday, one of the labor representatives said to me, "Do not push this now. We will put it in the Senate." I said, "Then, why not here? The representatives of the seven religious groups affected do not think their chances are any better in the Senate than they are here. Labor may oppose it there, too." Certainly there is no commitment from the Senate and this House and the Members here have our own responsibility to protect the rights of religious minorities as well as the rights of other minorities. This responsibility cannot be passed on to someone else.

We have engaged in a lot of polemics here this week and there has been the claim that all who support amendments to this bill are either right to workers or John Birch members. I am sure no one in this House would suggest that either the New York Times or the Washington Post is controlled by the John Birchers. And yet these two great liberal papers have had editorials only this week on this particular legislation. In today's New York Times in the editorial they said:

The administration's bill to nullify State right-to-work laws, which is expected to win House passage today, ranks well down the list of priorities in any program of labor law revision based on balanced protection for workers, employers and the overall national interest. As we have previously noted, there are strong arguments for believing that a uniform national policy ought to prevail on allowing or not allowing the union shop.

But it is nonsense to suggest that the resolution of this issue is the paramount industrial relations problem confronting the country or that a general green light for the union shop should be approved without additional safeguards for the rights of conscientious objectors and other opponents of compulsory unionism.

In the Washington Post editorial of this week they said:

No doubt there is much to be said for a national policy of tolerating or not tolerating the union shop in industries affecting interstate commerce. In passing the Taft-Hartley Act, Congress compromised on this controversial issue by letting the States set up their own separate policies. Some day it may wish to return to a uniform national policy, but we doubt that the time is now ripe, and the vehicle being rushed through Congress is far from being an appropriate one.

I recommend the reading of both editorials in full.

The attitude on the part of the opponents of this amendment is also in con-

trast to the views sent me by one of the finest labor leaders I have ever known—George Brown, the executive director of the legislative and political education department of the Oregon AFL-CIO:

JULY 2, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITH: The enclosed copy of my letter to Andy Bicmiller is self-explanatory and is being written to ascertain the national position on your bill.

Needless to say, we are in accord with you on this matter and I can foresee no objection from the labor movement in general.

We do have a policy that we will support the national AFL-CIO on legislation it is handling in Congress to avoid any embarrassment and confusion to that body.

Unless we meet with a definite policy of opposition we will publicly announce our support for H.R. 8962.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BROWN,
Executive Director, Legislative and Political Education Department, Oregon
AFL-CIO.

Let me read a letter from the secretary-treasury of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters in Portland—I think a very thoughtful—a very moving letter:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS
AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF
NORTH AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., July 8, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Congresswoman from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: In your recent letter to me you asked my comment on H.R. 8962 re individuals with religious convictions against financially supporting a labor union.

My first impression was, "It's a lot of folderol"; however, a long time ago I concluded that most of my first impressions are for the birds.

My first conclusion was the minority religious groups, the Amish, United Brethren, Plymouth Brothers, No. 4, Adventists, and so forth, were of minute consequence and we should not be too concerned about their convictions against belonging to labor unions and other fraternal organizations. I also felt that as a responsible union officer, union dues are very necessary to carry out the administration of a sound labor union and every industry worker should do his part in financing a good union.

On July 4, I was attending mass with my family as we do each Sunday. The visiting priest began his sermon something like this: "Today is a great day for all of us people who are fortunate enough to live in this great country. All of us, sometime today, should get down on our knees and thank Almighty God we can live in a country where people can worship and believe in a way of his choosing without fear." The expression emitted by this priest is not original, however, it is true and I hope it will always be this way.

This may sound a little strange, but the first thought that entered my mind was H.R. 8962 and your asking us to get behind it and support it.

I intend to go before the Multnomah County Labor Council in support of H.R. 8962, and wish to commend you for good, sound thinking in this piece of legislation.

Very truly yours,

ANTON A. WOLLECK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

One of the international officers of the Teamsters Union in Portland endorsed the conscience clause as right and proper; as did several other well-known labor leaders in Oregon.



Public Law 89-96
89th Congress, H. J. Res. 591
July 30, 1965

Joint Resolution

79 STAT. 285.

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-58), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1965".

Continuing ap-
propriations, 1966.
Ante, p. 205.

Approved July 30, 1965.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 689 (Comm. on Appropriations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 111 (1965):

July 28: Considered and passed House and Senate.

